

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 361

SP 008 034

AUTHOR Ortiz, Flora Ida
TITLE Workshops as Socialization Mechanisms.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, Illinois, April 15-19, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Change; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Role Perception; *Socialization; Teacher Workshops; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

This report attempts to establish some theoretical considerations dealing with the socialization process within workshop settings. The claim is made that the process of change is determined in part by the extent to which new role formation is achieved. Socialization theory is employed in an attempt to reconceptualize workshops in in-service training. Much of this report is based on the author's experiences in summer institutes designed as 3-week training sessions for school personnel and community representatives. The workshop setting was intended to simulate learning conditions that the laboratory hoped to install in classrooms. Lack of role definition and clarity of goals were major problems at the institute. No behavior changes were noted, but, according to the report, this can in large part be attributed to a situation that reinforced rather than removed old role conceptions. (JA)

ED 091361

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

WORKSHOPS AS SOCIALIZATION MECHANISMS

by
Flora Ida Ortiz
Assistant Professor
University of California, Riverside

Paper presented to American Educational Research Association
annual meeting, April 15-19, 1974, at Chicago, Illinois.

SP008 034

WORKSHOPS AS SOCIALIZATION MECHANISMS

In the improvement of the educational process, much has been said about changing participants' behavioral patterns. However; there is an absence of information related to the process by which these changes occur. For example, how do teachers become team-teachers and directors of inquiring minds? Traditionally, in-service training has claimed to prepare school personnel to fulfill certain new responsibilities and thereby contribute to changes within the public school systems. Learning new roles, behavioral patterns and attitudes are expressed as workshop goals. The expectations are that as programs are implemented new behavioral patterns, values and attitudes will be inculcated. The incongruency of this assumption lies in the lack of research findings relating new program adoption and lasting changes among school personnel. The limitations of workshop in-service training may lie in the neglect to formulate the process by which new roles emerge. More precisely, workshops may be considered as socialization mechanisms. The processes by which participants will acquire new modes of behaving and valuing may be considered as part of the in-service package.

The report which follows attempts to establish some theoretical considerations dealing with the socialization process within workshop settings. The claim is made that the process of change is determined in part by the extent to which new role formation is achieved. Socialization theory is employed in an attempt to reconceptualize workshop in-service training.

PART I

The Formal Purposes

The formal purposes of the Institute were articulated in the Regional Laboratory's Basic Program Plan. Summer institutes were designed as three week training sessions consisting of school personnel and community representatives. The workshop setting was intended to simulate learning conditions that the laboratory hoped to install in classrooms. A learning model based on inquiry and "de-schooling" procedures was used to train all members of the school and community team.

This training model would definitely reflect differential organizational patterns and would be based on needs assessment of participants divided into three main categories:

1) The school personnel who are responsible for the majority of instructional management tasks would receive specialized training in areas such as:

- a. Interaction process analysis (verbal and non-verbal);
- b. Diagnostic assessment procedures;
- c. Community sociology including cultural awareness and communication;
- d. Micro-teaching techniques for professional self-development;
- e. Use of various strategies of inquiry and discovery.

2) Community representatives would concentrate on areas of:

- a. Role of community and relationship of school and community, e.g., sharing accountability for student achievement;
- b. Role differentiation in reference to policy and administrative procedures;
- c. Working in the classroom as a facilitator;
- d. Training in assessment and evaluation;
- e. Construction of macro-environments.

3) The school and community trainees would merge groups and receive companion training in the areas of:

- a. The instructional program: rationale and installation;
- b. The development of a team approach to establishing and maintaining an activity centered classroom;
- c. Local dynamics of planning and interaction, including the establishment of a communication network;
- d. Techniques for establishing greater continuity between home, classroom, and the broader community.

The Descriptive Narrative

Some indication of how and to what degree the foregoing intentions were operationalized can be gleaned from the in situ field notes generated on

Tuesday, July 25.^{1,2,3}

8:45 Late beginning in David's absence. Participants are arranged in typical seating fashion, i.e., parents, teachers, and staff cluster separately with speaker up front. Burt leads re-hash of last night's community meeting. He seems quite pleased except for small attendance. About 53 people were in attendance; 20-25 from community, the rest were institute staff and participants. Immediate outcomes were: 1) a lady donated a fence; 2) two high school boys volunteered to work on weekends on the playground construction; and 3) concrete slabs were volunteered.

9:05 David arrives. Assigns participants to small groups. Leonore takes half of the parents to work on organizing systems and Cues. Linda takes half of the parents to discuss community relations. Teachers meet with David in lounge for introduction to mini-courses.

9:08 With teachers in lounge. Four films on effective questioning are to be shown. David directs, "Watch, take notes, try to apply in micro-teaching, use as a frame of reference." As David speaks, Nelson tries to figure out how to run projector. David says, "Mini-course and micro-teaching are one big unit."

¹ This was approximately mid-way through the institute.

² These notes, a fragment of the data collected, are used here for illustrative purposes only, and can neither be expected to cover the range of purposes previously identified nor the totality of the phenomena that occurred.

³ The narrative as presented is essentially in the same format as our field notes. Only mild editing has been done for the sake of clarity and readability.

- 9:14 David apologizing for "no handbooks" remarks, "I really want you teachers to go through the whole series." Lisa asks about time scheduled for this activity during next two weeks. David says, "Make time."
- 9:15 Film: "Organizing Independent Learning: Primary Level, Instructional Model Lesson 1" (Far West Lab for Ed. Res. and Dev.: Macmillan Educational Services, Inc., Reel #801). Activities related to the film were: 1) to establish concepts by providing examples of independent work; 2) to discuss working alone; 3) to elicit examples; and 4) to explain teacher's role. (There is little note-taking occurring).
- 9:29 Lisa's eyes are closed, practically asleep.
- 9:32 End of the film. David comments about its self-explanatory nature. LeRoy asks question regarding role of teacher given a very inquisitive child. David answers, "Very difficult." Prepares for next film. (I leave).
- 9:40 With Linda's group. I see a notice calling for meeting at Lab of all staff for 8:30 this a.m. Probably explains late start and absence of staff with the exception of Burt and facilitators.
- 9:50 Group talking so quietly it's almost private. General issue is how to gather the community together. Suggestions like an enchilada supper and engaging a neighborhood "rock" group are put forward. Principal throws cold water on "beer and circus come-ons." He wants to stick with the tried and true, e.g., "open house" and "reporting." He comments that the laboratory staff may be wrong "relative to community involvement...issue of parental fatigue" at end of day is raised.
- 9:59 Principal reviews difficulties in planning PTA meetings including, "Competing with a can of beer, TV, and baseball." He reiterates his concern for "whole school," and the "need to get parents into every room"... "meeting last night should have told the laboratory staff something. They broadcasted it widely, but community involvement just doesn't happen because you want it to."
- 10:04 Discussion wanders into past PTA meetings. Parent says, "People just hate to go to meeting."
- 10:11 Group adjourns for coffee and doughnuts. Same with organizing systems group.
- 10:21 (Obs.: There is a feeling of general disintegration. Staff sits in one corner, parents in the other. Members of each group talk quietly among themselves. Participants drift in and out of the room except for teachers. They may still be in lounge. I go there.)

- 10:29 In the lounge, the principal has joined the teachers. Mini-course films are still being shown. Film viewing is unbroken by discussion or practice.
- 10:35 End of film #3. David asks whether participants would like to practice skills demonstrated in first film via micro-teaching. LeRoy nods as does Lisa. LeRoy cautions, "Hold down to 3-4 kids." David says, "Don't be over-critical of yourself." Group breaks to go to micro-teaching stations. Teachers select children to take part. As the group leaves, David remarks, "Start thinking ahead to sessions on films 2 and 3." Principal asks about accompanying handbooks. None are available yet, but promised to have been delivered this a.m. David says to me, "The Lab let me down."
- 10:42 Lisa and Doris back with kids. David has turned on video-tape equipment. I ask why he doesn't have the participants operate it. David replies, "I was just thinking about that. That's part of the training." He turns everything off. Lisa tries to get it re-started. Another facilitator stands by.
- 10:45 LeRoy has gotten started with his "class" at station 2. Kay has her group ready. Lisa begins. She has a group of 3, Rick, Allen, Amy. She gets construction paper and crayons. Fourth child, Michael, joins group. Lisa has notes from film in hand. "big word," independent is introduced; a cue is given; someone who "works all alone." A definition is sought. Gets, "all by yourself." She tries to elicit examples from kids.. "my mommy works alone." Lisa elaborates on teacher "working alone" and with "kids." Two stations are going on simultaneously. We can barely hear Lisa due to LeRoy's replay. Lisa gives directions to draw pictures.. not "bother" her.. to work "all by yourselves." Lisa tries to complete entire sequence in first attempt. Analytically that violates the micro-teaching principle of practicing one skill at a time. ~~her~~ attempts to do so may be a function of David's not making that point clear. Lisa leaves group and comes to talk with Doris. I note that in fact the kids do not "work by themselves."
- 11:07 LeRoy and Kay sitting with Nelson. Presumably, he's providing feedback for them. LeRoy asks, "What do we do next?"
- 11:10 I go back to library. Meet someone on the way looking for the principal. Take her to his office. A staff member is taking pictures of two children posed looking up at a light pole. He exudes friendliness. After shooting, he asks, "Now do you want to take my picture?" They do.
- 11:13 Join Leonore's "organizing system" group. She's still developing "corn" as an organizer. Mothers still talking foods, recipes, and food preparation. One participant knows a local baker who is a native of Mexico. Suggestion is made that he be contacted to talk to classes. Some problem relative to his command of English. This

Best copy available

7

...is taking place in the absence of the teacher. It is evident that these "proceedings" are written up and are available to teachers.

...moves into discussion of interest centers. "Snowflake" and "milk" are suggested. That leads into discussion of local literature maker. The group engages in cataloging an inventory of community resources. Teachers aren't involved which reflects a major flaw in the planning.

...and Kay have just walked in. They sit at a table by themselves.

...move to the "community involvement" group. No real group discussion is going on. Eight participants converse in disjointed up snatches of conversation, e.e., the local fiestas they used to have. Several members are exchanging pictures of their children.

...join LeRoy, Kay and Nelson. Kay is reading the "Joachim" poem. LeRoy is chopping at the bit to do something. The next activity scheduled is the viewing of the British Infant School film. This is setting it up now. Other groups begin to break up.

...return to general meeting area. David announces film. Terms such as "interest centers," "open classrooms," and other related word.

...begins. I return to the university.

PART II

The Theoretical Framework

Change was the underlying theme of the Institute. Occasionally this theme was expressed explicitly; more often implicitly. It was clearly articulated by the staff members on the opening day of the Institute. For example, a staff member commented on the need to change the views of administrators, teachers, and the community relative to the school and its role in the educative process. But changing the views of administrators, teachers, and community members is not an easy task. On the contrary, the change process is indeed complex.

The extensive literature on planned organizational change focuses on the preconditions for change and the initiation of change, i.e., the process of introducing change into an existing structure. Two studies: Smith and Keith (1971) Anatomy of Educational Innovation and Gross, Giacquinta and Bernstein (1971) Implementing Organizational Change focus directly on the implementation process. The latter work more nearly parallels the design and intent of the Institute under consideration and is therefore the basis for part of the theoretical analysis.

Looking at Gross, et al. (1971) analysis we find that the Cambire experiment was an attempt to restructure the teacher's role (our emphasis) and presumably classroom functioning along the lines of the British Infant School Model. The emphasis was placed on restructuring the classroom in order to "create an environment or atmosphere where kids could make choices" (10). Presumably in such an atmosphere teachers would be "more productive"

and children more "responsible, self-directed and competent to manage themselves." The school as a whole would also "better reflect and better serve the community" (11). Unfortunately, the initial high hopes did not reach fruition.

In their analysis of the Cambire change efforts, Gross and his colleagues made several important contributions to our understanding of organizational change. For instance, they isolated three sequential stages in the life cycle of the change process. These are:

1. Initiation: "The period of time in which a particular innovation is selected and introduced into an organization.

2. Attempted implementation: "The period which begins after the announcement that an innovation will be adopted and focuses on efforts to make the changes in the behavior of organizational members specified by the innovation" (17)⁴

3. Incorporation: "The period when a change that is implemented becomes an enduring part of the operation of the organization" (17).

In the statement, "Toward a Theory of the Implementation of Organizational Innovation," Gross, et al. (1971) state that the degree to which an innovation is implemented will be a function of the extent to which five conditions are present during the period of attempted implementation. The first condition is the degree to which members of an organization have or develop a clear understanding of the innovation. The second condition is the extent to which the members of an organization

⁴On the basis of this definition, the Institute constituted the initial phase of implementation.

possess the capabilities needed to carry it out. The third condition is that their ability to carry out the innovation also depends on the availability of the materials and other resources it requires. The fourth condition is the compatibility of existing organizational arrangements with the innovation. The fifth is to expend the time and effort required for its implementation.

A review of Gross, et al. (1971) theoretical framework reveals the incongruity between the requisites necessary for change, i.e., the implementation period focusing on changes in the behavior of organizational members and the first three out of five conditions which are directly related to participant's behavioral patterns and the emphasis which was actually placed on the Cambire experiment. Emphasis was placed on restructuring the classroom.

Earlier in the discussion Gross, et al. (1971) state, "We maintain that teachers must exhibit new behavior patterns before it can be said that such innovations are actually being implemented" (90). While his argument is logical and compelling yet we feel uneasy. It seems to us that the emphasis should be placed on the acquisition and exhibition of "new behavior patterns" rather than on the timing of that behavior. Consequently our analysis differs from and goes beyond that of Gross, et al. The casual statement relative to the "need for teachers to be resocialized" (211) is central to our analysis.

In brief, our thesis is that planned organizational change is essentially a resocialization effort. We place our emphasis on

restructuring behavioral patterns among participants. In the present case, the Institute was conceived as an effort to resocialize ("change") administrators, teachers and parents so that behaviorally they might reflect the philosophy espoused in the program. Given that conception we briefly review some of the more salient socialization literature.

In his essay, "Socialization Through the Life Cycle," Brim (1967) argues that role acquisition is one of the primary aspects of adult socialization. He elaborates thus:

In the development of the individual's orientations toward the prescriptions of others for his behavior... a major component involves learning the "role of the other," that is trying to anticipate the other's response to one's own behavior, and reflecting upon one's own performance and appraising his behavior as good or bad (9).

If Brim is correct, then, it is incumbent upon us to ask, "How does one learn the "role of the other?" In brief, what are the mechanisms for role acquisition?

In a seminal pair of papers, Becker and Carper (1956a; 1956b) recast socialization as "identification" and asked, "What are the elements and mechanisms of work identification?" In brief, their comparative study of three graduate student groups (physiologists, engineers, and philosophers) suggested four major elements: 1) occupational title and associated ideology; 2) commitment to task; 3) commitment to particular organizations or institutional positions; and 4) significance for the larger society, i.e., issues of status, prestige and mobility. They further argued that the mechanisms by which identification were effected were: 1) the development of interest in, acquisition of, and pride in new skills; 2) the acquisition of an ideology which operates to produce commitment to an occupational title

(a function primarily of informal peer groups); 3) the internalization of motives; 4) sponsorship; and 5) the individual's "investment" in the identification process.

In a later article, Becker (1960) elaborates on the concept of "investment" under the larger rubric of "commitment," i.e., engaging in a consistent line of activity over time. He maintains that commitment is a function of "side bets." Becker writes:

The committed person has acted in such a way as to involve other interests of his, originally extraneous to the action he is engaged in, directly in that action. By his own actions prior to the final bargaining session he has staked something of value to him, something originally unrelated to his present line of action, on being consistent in his present behavior. The consequences of inconsistency will be so expensive that inconsistency in his bargaining stance is no longer feasible (35).

Becker further notes that "side bets" are made by the individual, by the employer in his name, or by the larger society. Consequently, commitment occurs by default as well as by conscious action. In any event, socialization cannot be said to have occurred until the individual demonstrates commitment. Our thesis restated then reads: successful implementation is contingent upon socialization and socialization in turn is contingent upon commitment.

All of this is not without some empirical evidence. In another passing statement Gross states, "Another difficulty that the director never recognized, and that served as a barrier to the implementation of the innovation, was the assistant director's lack of commitment to it" (211). (Emphasis ours).

To recapitulate, the implementation of innovation is a complex process. Our analytical framework begins with Gross' three stages of

implementation and their attendant assumptions and conditions. From there we strike out on our own choosing to recast implementation of innovation as a resocialization process. This course inevitably leads us into considering such concepts as role, role acquisition, identification, commitment and the like. Framed in this light, our initial questions become: Did the Institute provide the conditions and mechanisms favorable to the resocialization process? To what degree was resocialization accomplished?

The Analytical Framework Applied

Resistance to Change

We begin our analysis with Gross, et al. (1971) first assumption; namely, "if members of an organization are resistant to change, then overcoming this barrier constitutes an initial prerequisite for the implementation of innovation" (202). We suggest that resistance to change may be a function of the individual's perception of change as a threat to his established role identity and its associated beliefs, behaviors and expectations. Assuming this to be true, our first task is to examine the extant identities of the three groups participating in the institute.

Teachers

Our field notes provide no evidence to the effect that the teacher group was resistant to change. On the contrary, our data indicate quite clearly that the teachers as a whole volunteered to participate in the program. This is not to say they were wildly enthusiastic. There were reservation; reservations stemming from a lack of goal and procedural clarity. This was made explicit early in the institute. The field notes

read:

3:14 Lisa (teacher says she doesn't know what the goals of the institute are. LeRoy (teacher) adds that he doesn't know what they are here for. In his view, the institute's staff may be imposing things. He would like to have the goals reiterated, whether it is a trial, etc. The program for the institute must be clearly defined (7/18/72).

There was also some concern that past instructional practice would be drastically altered. At one point the field notes read:

A staff member is patiently and desperately trying to ally skepticism. Makes point that the basic reading program in content and structure will remain unaltered. A teacher nods violently in agreement and murmurs, "Just like we always have." (7/21/72)

In short, teachers were quite willing to adopt the innovation provided that it required no drastic changes in behavior.

Administrator

Administrator behavior was quite different. Our field notes contain frequent references like "Henri has not been around." His participation in the activities tended to be selective. Two contrasting examples are the following:

10:11 Only Henri seems to be deeply engrossed in the activity (The objectives/resources exercise) (7/24/72).

Henri walked around but spent most of his time at the doorway of the warehouse smoking his cigar and talking at length with the participants as they went by. The rest of the group were actively engaged in some cardboard carpentry activity. (Summ. Obs. Int., 7/26/72).

Henri's lack of involvement may be explained by his statements later in the Institute. The field notes read:

8:50 Henri comes in. General discussion about the program. Henri comments: "I believe in going along... humor these federal projects. How else do you get funded?" (Soft chuckles from rest of group.) Group member asks for his reaction relative to yesterday's cooking session. Henri says, "Messy" (8/1/72).

Henri projected "calculative" as opposed to "moral" involvement (Etzioni, 1961). More generally, he took a conservative gradualistic stance.⁵ At one point our Summary Observations and Interpretations read:

The third major impression from the morning is the administrative conservatism that is displayed. I recall a casual conversation in which Henri used the phrase, "Don't rock the boat." I was reminded of it when his group came to the "Getting in and out of deep water" phrase in the "Characteristics of a Good Teacher" exercise. One of the participants suggested "Try it, you'll like it." Henri would buy "willingness to experiment" but did not wish to be associated with the former response. He made that quite clear. (7/21/72).

Programmatically that conservative tendency was expressed in terms of basic skills development. When the participants were asked late in the Institute to identify "how they'd like the school to be in five years," Henri responded, "Basic skill performance should be improved" (8/2/72).

In brief, our data suggest that while the administrative leadership of the school was not overtly resistant to change neither was it strongly committed to it - at least not in the form proposed by the Institute's program. From our perception, no basic changes in administrative beliefs and behaviors occurred as a result of the Institute.

Parents

To ourselves as observers we characterized the parents as exhibiting skepticism. Their participation in the Institute gave evidence of a

⁵The rather dismal record of the past decade of educational innovations, especially when initiated by outside agencies, provide ample warranty for administrative conservatism.

surface willingness to consider change. However, it became clear as the institute progressed that the changes desired were in the direction of a) maintaining sacred values, and b) increased emphasis upon basic skills.⁶ For example, on the first day of the Institute and following the viewing of the film "What's New in School?" the following statements by parents were recorded in the field notes:

What about the things they need to know? Do children learn in a school like that? How do you know if you don't test them? The community has always looked up to the school for real book knowledge (7/17/72).

The concerns about instituting "open education" were constantly present and voiced.⁷ Some time later in the Institute the following was recorded:

9:01 Parent apologizes for being "off the subject" and then proceeds to ask questions about "the progressive system in the East and campus riots that follow. (Obs. I think she's referring to the Progressive Education movement.) Burt picks up main point and reacts negatively to posited relation between riots and Progressive Education. Shifts to differences in current project through the use of environment and community involvement.

9:12 Mark tries to shift the discussion back to the scheduled activity. Gets cut off by question relative to the "evidence" of the effectiveness of "open education" in contrast to the "traditional." Mark responds that the research from North Dakota indicates that open education

6

This suggests another reason for administrative conservatism. Administrators who tend to get "too far out front" of their constituencies tend to have short tenure.

7

In the preceding school year another school in the district had attempted to change to "open education" on a school-wide basis. The attempt was not altogether successful and strong community sentiments were aroused. The institute participants were well aware of the situation and it hovered like a ghost in the background.

"doesn't hold kids back" and is a plus in terms of kids liking school, liking reading, etc. Parent: "You mean the kids are not learning more under the new than under the old." Mark: "That's true." Parent goes into a rambling monologue about the danger of kids "questioning their own God" and becoming "doubting Thomases" if they "follow the Dewey system to the extreme!" (7/21/72).

In brief, parents, or at least the more vocal, were skeptical of things that threatened to depart substantially from traditional practices. This skepticism was also directed against incorporating strong ethnic dimensions into the program. For example, during an "assessment" exercise the observer noted: "Parents, in contrast to staff, tend to rate ethnic studies and second language acquisition low" (7/28/72). An even more striking expression of anti-ethnic sentiment came after viewing the film, "I am Joaquin." One parent stated bluntly, "I would not want any of these cultural factors introduced to my children" (7/19/72).⁸

Our data thus far has indicated that there was little evidence of enthusiastic endorsement or commitment to the proposed innovation. While there was little overt resistance displayed by any group, the participants

⁸The observer was apparently sitting with the parent group which most strongly reflected "traditional" values when these observations and quotations were recorded. Other data collected by the staff tend to be contradictory, suggesting that parents as a whole ranked second language acquisition and the ethnic component of the curriculum at the same level of importance as did the staff. This has several major implications. Methodologically, it indicates both the limitations of participant observation as a singular data collection strategy and the necessity for interaction between Level I and Level II evaluators. More importantly, it indicates the danger in conceptually defining the "community" as a behaviorally and attitudinally unified body. Clearly, differences exist within that group, and the concept of community must of necessity be redefined as an aggregate of constituencies. The strategy implications for developers concerned with "community involvement" should be obvious.

as a whole appeared to be reluctant to move rapidly in the direction of the proposed changes. If this analysis is correct, our next question becomes, "What mechanisms were utilized in the Institute to generate commitment and make possible the acquisition of new role identities?"

Attempts to Clarify Goals and Roles

It appeared to us that throughout the life of the Institute there was a constant struggle to achieve clarity of goals. Despite efforts by the staff through lectures, films, demonstrations, and group activities, goal clarity proved too illusive. Perhaps the very complexity of the task precluded any simple statement. In any event, we continuously heard comments like the following:

Lisa: "I don't know what the goals are." (7/18/72).

Antonia (a parent): "I don't know what I'm coming for!" (7/18/72).

Burt (in reference to the planned community visit): The Institute's program should not be discussed. Everything is not completely clear [7/24/72).

Diane (facilitator speaking about visit to home): "We have nothing to sell" (7/25/72).

The staff was aware of these problems but recognition came perhaps too late. Midway through the Institute a staff member commented, "The roles of the participants have not been worked out" (7/21/72).

With ambiguous goals, role definition became extremely difficult. This was particularly true with reference to the role of community members. More frequently this was referred to as "community involvement." From our perception the concept of "community involvement" was not explicitly defined either conceptually or operationally. Again from our

perspective, failure to do so was a critical flaw in the Institute, particularly since community involvement was loosely defined as "a partnership for providing education" (7/17/72)⁹. By definition a partnership involves a close working arrangement. When such an arrangement attempts to bridge traditional lay (parent) and professional (teacher) roles, major role redefinition must take place. Again, the staff was aware of the necessity for dealing with the issue. One staff member commented, "We must deal with the issue of community involvement" (7/25/72).

⁹ Professor Martin Burlingame expresses some views on the concept of "community involvement."

"The relationship ~~between~~ school and community has been little explored by educational researchers. Those few who have ventured into the field have tended to focus on the tension between professionals and laymen. On the other hand, practicing administrators waver between defining "community involvement" as support for the educator's ideas and as "community distrust," i.e., fear of a public denial of the educator's ideas. Schoolmen act as if successful "community involvement" means simultaneously pleasing and leading the public. Some researchers in education suggest strongly that professional expertise may lead inevitably to combined lay-professional decision-making.

Political science literature has only hastily explored the relationship between the school and the community. Of the few who have written in the field, most suggest that the schools cater to a special interest group - the parents of attending children. Schoolmen seek to elicit support from this group, e.g., for financial support, and also give in to this group's demands, e.g., for athletic teams.

In the absence of explicit role definitions, participants had to inductively determine from the activities of the Institute what their respective role dimensions were. This was difficult due to the ambiguity of cues. At times traditional roles were reinforced. For example:

Discussion moves into community involvement issue. Formal contacts are listed including continuance of the Parent Advisory Council, parent club meetings (4 times per year), briefings along with report cards, parent conference, telephone contacts, disciplinary contacts, and informal contacts (7/24/72).

Traditional "mother" roles were also reinforced but more subtly. In the following excerpt parents (mothers) were presumably engaged in the construction of an "organizing system" based on corn. Our Summary Observations and Interpretations interpreted that activity as follows:

Leonore had a tough job. She had apparently spent a long time thinking the subject through but had to play the role of developer. Perhaps that accounts for it turning out to be either a monologue or a dialogue with the one teacher in the group or with other staff members who chanced by. Active parent participation occurred only during the "foods and cooking" portions of the discussion. In part that was a function of Leonore directly addressing questions related to food to them. That raises a significant issue. The role of woman as housewife is steadily reinforced. Perhaps that's the critical variable in the program. Thus far mothers have clearly demonstrated their "incorporation" into the wife/mother/housewife role and react anxiously to any other role definition. More generally, it may account for the parental skepticism relative to the program. The message transmitted is that mothers are mothers who teach the "common sense things" and teachers are teachers who teach "book learning." That same phenomenon was noticeable when the children were present in the morning examining bones. I noticed no mothers interacting in an "instructive" way with the children. That role was reserved for the laboratory's staff and teachers (7/18/72).

At other times during the institute some very different messages were communicated. Parents were also viewed as persons who could locate community resources for incorporation into the instructional program. This borders on redefining parents as teacher aides. Occasionally that role was clearly anticipated. For example:

Burt: "There are enough things to do in a classroom to keep 100-200 parents involved" (7/21/72).

Teacher: "It takes time to put up interest centers. This is where I need help. This is where parents can help" (8/1/72).

Mark: "Some parents are extremely adept at handling equipment (video tape)" (7/19/72).

There was also clear indication that parents would, upon occasion, play the role of teacher. A staff member's early statement, "All of us are teachers" set the stage for parental involvement in such activities as micro-teaching and the development of organizing systems. At one point our field notes read:

David: "We would like you parents to view a mini-course so that you will be familiar with that technique." Leonore announces that parents will prepare a lesson for Friday (7/25/72).

There was a fourth parent role implied in the institute. Activities such as training in interaction analysis, ~~assessment~~, and resource allocation suggested that decision-making and evaluation were legitimate parent roles. Given this array of roles and expectations, it was not entirely surprising that parent participation tapered off toward the end of the institute and that a parent explained in dismay, "What are they trying to do to us!"

The Elements and Mechanisms of Identification

Our analysis thus far has indicated both goal and role ambiguity. Our thesis at this point is that this phenomenon was a function of not engaging the identification mechanisms delineated earlier by Becker and

Carper. We now look at these more carefully.

Being "Taught in a New Way."

Becker and Carper (1956a) suggest that identification is facilitated if the neophyte is "taught in a new way." We would argue that for the most part teaching during the Institute was done in the most traditional way.

For example, our first day's field notes read in part:

(Obs. The opening session had some of the most negative features of the "traditional" classroom. It was much like the first day of school all over. The "teacher" sat up in front, did most of the talking ("direct influence"), distributed materials, and gave short "introductions to the course." Students in turn sat listening and responded compliantly. This pattern was encapsulated in the questionnaire exercise. While the "students took the test" the "teachers" wandered about the room monitoring. Perhaps the most striking feature of it all was the low hushed tone of the room. (7/17/72).

Perhaps, however, the statement which best reflected the traditional nature of Institute teaching was that made by a staff member late one day: "We have a few more minutes before the bell rings for dismissal. Do you have any general feelings about the day?" (7/21/72).

Generally, the participants played a passive role. Lecture-like activities were prominent. When the participants were active, the format was more of an "assign-study-recite" nature than anything else, e.g., "you will prepare a lesson for tomorrow." The two notable exceptions were the cooking/sewing and cardboard carpentry sessions about which will say more later.

Acquisition of Title

Title and role are inextricably tied together. The reconceptualization of the educative process as a "partnership" implicitly suggest some alteration in titles as well as roles. This did not occur. Throughout the life of the

Institute teachers were referred to as teachers, parents as parents.⁹

Those titles and implied identities were scrupulously honored. For example:

Participants break up into small groups. Parents get together as do teachers. ~~One non-teacher~~ makes signs of joining the teacher group. She's asked, "Are you a teacher or a parent?" Before she can answer, a member of the teacher group says, "You're here as a parent. All four of us will move or you may" (7/21/72).

In general, when participants worked in small groups the pattern described in the initial descriptive narrative was followed: parents with parents, teachers with teachers. In some sense this was consistent with Institute plans, but was dysfunctional in generating "partnership" relations. Again, that problem was recognized by the regional laboratory's staff. Late in the Institute one staff member said, "We'll have to break up the teacher group. Would you mind? We don't want to have all teachers in one group and parents in another" (8/12/72). In brief, "cluster training" relative to small groups meant separate clusters.¹⁰

⁹There was no formal administrative group. Officially there was only one administrator, the principal, present. However, both male teachers held administrative credentials and one had recently held a principalship. In small group work the male teachers and principal typically joined the teacher group though there were frequent exceptions. For the principal such behavior was consistent with his designation as "chief liaison officer" between the school and the community. It is also interesting to note in this connection that the male teacher who had recently been appointed as reading coordinator clearly wished to be formally disassociated from the teacher group. On one occasion he frankly stated, "I am not a teacher. Isn't it nice to be able to direct a reading program?"

¹⁰Beyond the issue of identity through title, the separation into discrete groups reinforced existing identities. As Becker and Carper argue, identity is also a function of informal group interaction and peer influence.

The Development of Interest in, Acquisition of, and Pride in New Skills

We have already commented upon the "introduction to" nature of the Institute.¹¹ The range of activities provided by the Institute afforded ample "problem interest" opportunities. Our observations suggest that for teachers the micro-teaching and mini-courses were the most stimulating. This is reasonable in terms of perceived professional roles. The parents appeared to be most taken with the interaction analysis.¹² Both groups responded favorably to the cardboard carpentry and the cooking/sewing activity. "Organizing systems" seemed to generate little enthusiasm within either group, and the assessment and "performance objectives" activities still less.¹³ Analytically, with the exception of interaction analysis, parents exhibited progressively less interest as the activities became more technically "professional."

A more crucial question is to inquire into the intensity of the "new skill learning" opportunities. We note that Gross (1971) indicated quite clearly that the Cambire attempt at innovation floundered in part because "teachers did not possess the capabilities needed to perform in accord with the new role model"(124). Our impression was that the Institute planners

¹¹Not unreasonable if viewed in the light of a five-year program.

¹²There was some indication that parents were interested in acquiring this skill in order to engage in evaluative activities. This despite the statement by the instructor that that was a misuse of the instrument.

¹³It is interesting to note that the activities which generated the least participant enthusiasm were those most crucial to the laboratory staff. The point is simply that the perceived needs of developers ("initiators") are substantially different from those of implementers. That's another unresolved issue in the change process literature.

opted for minimum exposure to a maximum number of skill building activities rather than maximum exposure to a limited number. In the short run this may be dysfunctional. We doubt that even the more frequent micro-teaching experience provided for the teachers was sufficient to "freeze" new behavior patterns.

In the absence of specific skill development, pride in new skills is unlikely. Yet there was one exception to that. It occurred as an outcome of the cardboard carpentry activity. Since that activity was substantially different from the others, we will deal with it in some detail. Our field notes record:

- 8:30 At "off-campus" carpentry location. Looks like a reconverted warehouse...just about everyone here. Stacks of construction paper, cardboard, tools, tape, paint, etc. in evidence.. Muriel apparently in charge.
- 8:47 Muriel begins. Makes reference to "doing" in contrast to "sitting"...talks about use of paper as a "communication art form"...shifts into dramatic tale (which she does very well)...ends with directions to group to "make the thing"...
- 9:00 All groups busy. All groups composed of parents, teachers, and facilitators. (Later field notes read: the group is so mixed up that I have to stop to think if they're parents, facilitators, or teachers.)
- 9:37 - 9:50 Field notes contain description of paper creations and discussion that follows. Also includes a comment about "getting loosened up."
- 9:55 Walt introduces cardboard carpentry...
- 10:10 Groups begin work.
- 2:30 Participants actively sawing, hammering, talking, painting, etc. They move purposefully and actively, helping one another as they tape, paint, hold and saw...
- 2:50 Participant says with pride as she points to finished product (chair), "I think I should have a patent for that" (7/26/72).
- 8:30 A dozen or so people are here as I arrive. Much activity, painting, sawing, selecting carpeting for chair covers, etc. Coffee already made. Radio is turned to a Spanish language station and participants are singing along. In short, the contrast between yesterday and today and the earlier days of the Institute is most striking. The point may simply be that there is a task focus emerging which the group finds engaging.

11:45 Kay (teacher) enthusiastically describes domino game she is developing and the house which she is building which can double as a store, puppet stage, regular house or whatever. Pedro walks by, stops, and Kay goes through her routine again.

1:00 Lisa brought some teacher friends back with her from lunch. She describes her "art" objects to them. (Obs.: Later, Nelson took them out to the garage to see what Kay had made. It's amazing to see the "pride in work" displayed as participants "show off" their finished products.)

3:00 Much interaction. Some very superficial, some quite personal. Several exchanges related to children attending school. Lisa talks to one of the parents about a child she will be getting next year. Diane and two parents discussing how children behave in informal situations. Lisa, Leonore and Diane chat briefly about being "really well-prepared" the first day of school. Parents compare notes on kids (7/27/72).

From our perception, the carpentry exercise was highly functional.

There was clarity of purpose related to the micro-environment ideology.

The task was within the capabilities of the group. Status, title and, more generally, role differentiation disappeared as the groups worked collaboratively. Opportunities for genuine person to person interaction and partnership development were present. Necessary resources were available. In brief, problem interests were defined, skills were acquired (or discovered!) and pride in work emerged. One discouraging footnote must, however, be added to complete this account. The last of the day's entries in the field notes read:

When the end of the day arrived and the staff and participants gathered to review and plan, the parents sat on one side of the warehouse and the teachers on the other (7/27/72).

Internalization of Motives, Sponsorship and Investment

It would perhaps be premature to expect to see evidence of the internalization of motives, emergence of sponsorship, and the consequences of investment decisions this early in the program. Yet some indications of

the effects of the training institute are available. Not unexpectedly there are both positive and negative indicators. On the positive side we have such statements as:

Parent: "My negative ideas are becoming more positive" (7/19/72).
 Teacher: "I never would have given thought to using parents before" (8/4/72).
 Parent: "Enjoyed it very much..never worked so hard..got the most out of being involved with the teachers. They're people too!" (8/4/72).

Some comments were negative, e.g., "We wasted an awful lot of time" (8/4/72). Then, too, parent "drop-out" was a clear negative indicator. From our perception, however, the most striking evidence of the institute's impact (or lack of impact) on the participants was revealed in an episode which occurred the second last day. We recorded it as follows:

1:15 In Lisa's classroom. It's painted off white. Muriel suggests, "Start with color, bright colors activate the senses. Blues and violets are restful colors."
 Doris: "If we want quiet rooms we will need bland colors."
 Muriel asks what areas are designated for what interest centers. No response. She asks again more directly.
 Lisa: "I don't know...I don't know, I am so confused now."
 Muriel suggests that she start with the room the way it is--barren desks piled in the center and tables and chairs lined up against the wall in the back. Lisa: "I like to have my room bright and cheerful and ready. I'd hate to see my kids come to this." Doris: "We can change later. We can start with the room ready." LeRoy: "Keep the environment until the students need change." Principal to Muriel: "What sorts of things could you make and change?" Diane indicates child-oriented things would be best. Principal: "It is not realistic to begin with a disorganized room. I would like every child to go home the first day and say, 'My room at school is neat!'" (8/3/72).

In short, we would argue that there were few basic changes in behaviors. "Confusion" may be a necessary step to change but it falls far short of the skills necessary to implement change.

We would also conclude that basic attitudes were not substantially altered. The principal's conservatism was as much in evidence at the end of the institute as at the beginning. Teacher attitudes tended to be favorable but they were at the start. Nor did we perceive changes in parental attitude which would clearly indicate that the concept of "community involvement" was altered. For example:

2:30 I chat with parents regarding closing perceptions of Institute. Mrs. M.: "It's something to do in the summertime. I have enjoyed going to school." Mrs. N.: I have learned a lot about teaching my children. I already teach catechism and this will help improve my teaching." Mrs. O. and Mrs. P. feel their children are "very lucky" to be able to go to school now. Mrs. Q. comments that at first she was "quite scared" about the Institute but now she thinks it "has been a good thing" (8/3/72).

In sum, the reactions to the Institute were differentially distributed. For some parents it was a summertime thing, an educational experience valuable in a highly personalistic way. Perhaps that is the strongest indication that no substantial resocialization occurred. For developers it was an opportunity to gain formative implementation data and, in that sense, the staff member who said, "It was an excellent start. I am satisfied with the parent input above all" was absolutely correct. For teachers it meant different things. For those who struggled with the philosophy of the program it meant anxiety. Those who appeared to be more sanguine appeared more confident. In general we would suggest that the perceptions of Institute participants fell neatly along a continuum of immediacy. The further one was removed from direct involvement in the implementation process, the more satisfying it was.

PART III

The Theoretical Framework Revisited

Our working thesis was that the implementation of innovation is essentially a resocialization process. We have tried our hand at analyzing the Institute in that light. We do not claim to have treated that issue exhaustively or even very well. Yet the data we have marshalled supports the contention that if the Institute did not live up to expectations, it was largely because insufficient attention was paid to the nature of the socialization process.

Socialization is not a simple or well-understood phenomenon. We have only the glimmerings of some of the elements and mechanisms at work. Its totality is at present hidden from view.

Yet even with a paucity of understanding it seems to us that there is considerable power in conceptualizing innovation as socialization. Firstly, it directs attention to role specification. Secondly, it directs attention to those elements and mechanisms operative in the acquisition of roles. Thirdly, it directs attention to the conditions under which socialization is best effectuated. Fourthly, it provides articulation with a broader range of social science literature than has been used heretofore. Finally, it provides an alternative for analyzing outcomes. We elaborate briefly.

The concept of role is central in the social science.¹⁴ While there are multiple definitions, most writers are in agreement on two basic points: 1) that the concept of role connotes a set of expectations relative to beliefs and behaviors, and 2) that operationally any given role is meaning-

¹⁴

For a review of definition in use, see Gross, N., Mason, W., and McEachern, A. Exploration in Role Analysis. New York: Wiley, 1958.

ful only in relation to other roles (reciprocal relationships or "counter positions"). From our perception the roles of the Institute participants were not clearly specified. Our data indicated that role expectations were ambiguous, and such ambiguity made the establishment of "partnership" relations most difficult.

Lack of role specificity was most noticeable relative to parents ("community involvement"). According to our data, parents expressed constant "apprehension" about entering the classroom--the teachers' domain. Similarly, teachers expressed concern over their being there. We would argue that the roots of that fear lay in the failure to precisely define roles. What message do teachers receive when parents are trained, however slightly, in interaction analysis or micro-teaching? More broadly we would argue that until the concept of "community involvement" is conceptually and operationally defined, the "apprehensions" expressed at the Institute will persist and thus thwart any meaningful kind of "partnership."¹⁵

Our second point was that focusing on socialization draws attention to the mechanisms by which that process is effectuated. Sequentially, one must first be retrospective and examine existing belief and behavior patterns in order to determine resistance to change.¹⁶ In the present case our data

¹⁴We are tempted to say that "community involvement" is a relatively meaningless phrase at this time. "Communities" are not involved, individuals are. And individuals function within the context of established role identities. We tend to think that continued use of the phrase obscures thought with rhetoric and over-simplifies an extremely complex issue.

¹⁵We have no evidence which indicates whether the institute planners did or did not make such an assessment nor of the extent of that assessment if one was made.

indicated no substantial amount of "dissatisfaction capital" (Pohland and Ortiz, 1971) prior to or following the Institute. Indeed, except for two of the teachers there appeared to be a strong desire to a) maintain current practices, and b) strengthen the more traditional aspects of the school curriculum.

Once past the resistance hurdle, efforts can be concentrated on the mechanisms of socialization. Here we are particularly indebted to Becker and Carper. Without reviewing their work or our own analysis here, suffice it to say that the mechanisms specified by Becker and Carper were more conspicuously absent than present, de-emphasized rather than emphasized.

Our third point was that conceptualizing innovation as socialization directs attentions to the conditions under which it takes place. We have already noted that socialization is presumed to be most effective if the neophyte is "taught in a new way." We have also noted that in general the instructional aspects of the Institute were executed in the most traditional way. We do not wish to pursue that issue further at this point. Rather, we wish to direct our attention to the setting qua setting in which the socialization process occurs.

From our perception the most successful portion of the Institute centered on the cardboard carpentry experience. As we have noted, it facilitated the development of problem interest, development of new skills, pride in accomplishment, the integration of group members, and indicated in a simple way how the ideology of the program might be implemented. The major point we wish to make here is that this activity took place on neutral ground. Neither parents nor teachers could lay claim to the warehouse as their domain. The lay-professional distinctions became largely irrelevant.

We submit that the neutrality of the setting facilitated the development of the "partnership" concept.

In contrast the bulk of the Institute was held on the school premises--the teachers' turf. We would argue that dominant attitudes and beliefs relative to the role of parents in school--attitudes and beliefs tenderly nourished by the profession--placed the parents at a distinct disadvantage. The general practice of dividing into separate parent and teacher groups did little to break down the academic wall of separation. Under such conditions "apprehensions" are nourished and "partnerships" starved.

Let us expand on the neutrality issue further. From the reports of the participants, parents particularly, the cooking/sewing session was "the best day." Note that the activity took place in the school cafeteria. This was a setting which emphasized traditional wife/mother roles. The symbols of the home were dominant--sewing machines, cloth, etc. It was essentially a magnified extension of the home albeit institutionally housed. In contrast, the school library where most of the sessions were held contained the visible symbols of the school: books, teaching machines, study carrels and the like. To be sure, a school library is more neutral than a classroom, but it is also considerably less neutral than a cafeteria or warehouse. In brief, we would argue that Bridges' (1966) recommendation for an off-campus site is still worthy of consideration. Gratuitously we would suggest that if the local school building is the only feasible site to hold such an institute, then one might be well advised to go "whole hog" and schedule a substantial portion of the institute's activities in the classrooms where the program will be implemented. Such a course of action might go far toward reducing

parental apprehensions relative to intruding upon the teacher's domain. It might also be functional in clarifying respective lay and professional roles and thus further the development of partnership relations.

Our final point was that reconceptualizing innovation as socialization leads one into a wider range of social science literature. As Gross (1971) has pointed out, our current literature is inadequate in explaining the implementation process. As we have indicated throughout this report, hinging the implementation process on the concept of role gives us a broader range of conceptual tools.

An Unanalyzed Issue: The Macro-Environment

This report has not been exhaustive. Like the initial descriptive narrative it has been selective. We chose to isolate what appeared to us to be the most significant phenomena and pursue them to the exclusion of others. We make this statement again because readers of this report may well note the almost total absence of any reference to the macro-environment aspect of the program. This has been deliberate and for two major reasons. First, the major reconstruction of the school premises appeared to be an independent project related to the program in only the most general way. This is not to say that it is or was peripheral to the philosophy of the program. Large group sessions and the community meeting were addressed to macro-environmental issues. Participants were indeed encouraged to and did provide input into the design and thus elaborated one dimension of "community involvement." Yet, and this is our second major point, we could detect no efforts to change behaviors. The roles of parents and

teachers remained essentially unaltered relative to the macro-environment. We could detect no efforts to engage the participants in developing problem interests, in acquiring new skills, in altering their ideology if you will. Perhaps this was a function of the incompleteness of the macro-environment re-development. If so, a later institute focusing on the utilization of the macro-environment in the teaching/learning process would be in order.

There are, however, two points we would like to make. The minor one is that the separateness of the two programs, teacher training and site development, on some fundamental level violated the concept of "cluster training." While there was some programmatic overlap, the two sets of participants rarely interacted in any consistent or meaningful way.

The more major issue is related to our concern for role acquisition. We would argue that the separation of programs further reinforced traditional roles and their associated mythologies. Consider: women are traditionally expected to remain indoors, to cook and sew, to be intimately associated with the education of children, to do "the lighter work." Men, in contrast, are to work with their hands outdoors, to be engaged in heavy physical labor. These respective roles were clearly respected during the Institute. This brings us full circle back to the central thesis of this report; namely, that if old roles remain unaltered, if attitudes and beliefs, behaviors and expectations for behavior remain unchanged, then by definition resocialization has not occurred and any attempt to implement an innovation which requires new roles will be seriously jeopardized.

In conclusion, we have not minimized the problems involved in implementing change. Nor have we isolated and examined all of the relevant dimensions of organizational change. Clearly, we omitted important considerations, but our propensities were to look at the Institute from a different perspective. Ultimately, however, the future of similar programs will be determined by the degree of success encountered in coping with the manifold dimensions of implementing organizational change.

REFERENCES

- Becker, H. S. "Notes on the Concept of Commitment." American Journal of Sociology. LXVI (July, 1960), pp. 32-40.
- _____ and Carper, J. "The Development of Identification with an Occupation," American Journal of Sociology. LXI (January, 1956), pp. 289-298.
- _____. "The Elements of Identification with an Occupation." American Sociological Review, XXI (June, 1956), pp. 341-348.
- Bridges, E. "The Seminar on Instructional Leadership." Technical Report Series #1, CEMREL, Inc., St. Ann, Missouri, 1966.
- Brim, O. and Wheeler, S. Socialization After Childhood. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- _____. Communication Arts Program II: Basic Program Plan. SWCEL, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1972.
- Etzioni, A. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press, 1961.
- Gross, N., Mason, W. and McEachern _____ Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- _____, Giacquinta, J. and Bernstein, M. Implementing Organizational Innovations. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971.
- Pohland, P. and Ortiz, F. Final Report: Communication Arts Program, Model II, Terien and Springly. SWCEL, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1971.
- Smith, L. M. and Keith, P. Anatomy of Educational Innovation. New York: Wiley, 1971.
- Spindler, G. "Education in a Transforming American Culture." Harvard Educational Review. 25 (1955), pp. 145-156.
- Zander, A. "Resistance to Change: Its Analysis and Prevention," Advanced Management Journal, XV (January, 1950), pp. 9-11.

APPENDIX A

Methodology

This report is based on a participant-observation evaluation conducted for a regional laboratory. The intent of the study was to: 1) provide a summative evaluation of an in-service cluster training institute; 2) to sketch a framework for analyzing such institutes; and 3) to suggest alternative strategies for the implementation of change.

The data upon which this report is based was obtained by two outside non-participant observers. The observers were in attendance throughout the life of the institute either singly or jointly. Typically, one observer attended the morning session and the other was present in the afternoon. During the latter stages two similar institutes were initiated at other sites. The observers also attended portions of one of them for comparative data purposes.

The observing process included three components: 1) direct observation of the institute proceedings; 2) informal conversations with staff members and participants; and 3) collection of documents. In toto we amassed in excess of 240 pages of handwritten notes. In brief, we feel that the intensity of involvement and quantity of data gathered provide an adequate base for the report which follows.